



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

other hand, very little, if at all, impede Western civilization, and needed, therefore, not to be mentioned by Professor Haeckel together with the Christian superstitions, nor was there for the same reason any necessity for the courageous philosopher of Jena to denounce the "wild theories" alluded to in the article under review.

PAUL VON RAUTENFELD.

SWATOW, CHINA.

EDITORIAL REPLY.

We take pleasure in publishing Herrn von Rautenfeld's protest against our criticism of Professor Haeckel's theses. It proves that our monistic friend of Jena has staunch supporters all over the world, even in Swatow of distant China, but having read Herrn von Rautenfeld's arguments we do not feel compelled to change our views. The Editor of *The Monist* is a personal friend of Professor Haeckel, but the cause of monism would not be well served if for the sake of politeness he would abstain from criticism and avoid controversy.

In former numbers we have discussed our differences with Professor Haeckel, and there is no need of repeating them.* Be it sufficient here to state that we deem these differences of great importance because their recognition would prevent monism from being narrowed down to a onesided partisan issue, and we feel convinced that Professor Haeckel himself would accept our view if we could have a quiet hour's talk with him.

A LETTER FROM PROFESSOR MACH.

The July number of *The Monist* contained an editorial article on "Professor Mach's Philosophy" written in reply to Dr. Hans Kleinpeter's essay "On the Monism of Professor Mach," which appeared in the April number. Dr. Kleinpeter in his enthusiasm for the master whose lead he follows had been carried away in some of his statements to such an extent as to render Professor Mach's

* "Professor Haeckel's Monism and the Ideas of God and Immortality," *The Open Court*, V, 2957 (Sept. 17, 1891); "Professor Haeckel's Confession of Faith," *The Open Court*, VII, 3529 (Jan. 1893); "Monism not Mechanicalism," *The Monist*, II, 438; "Professor Haeckel's Monism," *The Monist*, II, 598; "Theology as a Science," *The Monist*, XIII, 24; "Haeckel's Theses for a Monistic Alliance," *The Monist*, XVI, 120.

views and way of treating problems the final authority in matters philosophical, to the exclusion of all others, criticizing among them also the monism of *The Monist*. The editor not without reluctance undertook to answer Professor Kleinpeter's claims and uphold his own views in face of the new orthodoxy that was put up by this able disciple of one of our most prominent leaders in modern philosophy. We trust that our readers felt that the criticism necessarily implied in our comments should not be taken as any lack of appreciation for a man whose merits in science and philosophy are unquestioned in the world of contemporaneous thought, and we cherish Professor Mach's friendship not only for the sake of his scientific accomplishments, but also for the amiable spirit with which he deals with all questions of a personal nature. Nothing can be more characteristic of the simple modesty of his nature than the letter which he wrote the Editor after the perusal of the two articles. We publish it here in the original German as it would lose many of the fine points in an English translation.

“Hochgeehrter Herr und Freund!

“Die Artikel im *Monist*, April und Juli, habe ich gelesen. Ich bin Ihnen sehr dankbar, dass Sie gedämpft haben. Uebertreibungen können nur unangenehm empfunden werden.

“Ich habe vom Boden meiner Spezialwissenschaft aus einzelne Motive der Methode klar gelegt. Darin bin ich nicht einmal allein, wie ich oft genug hervorgehoben habe. Stallo, Avenarius, Schuppe und wahrscheinlich noch viele andere haben mitgewirkt. Eine abgeschlossene Philosophie habe ich nie gegeben und auch nie beabsichtigt. Darum ist es auch nicht meine Sache, andere Philosophen zu kritisiren. Darum, weil ich einige Sätze vertrete, behaupte ich noch nicht, dass von andern vertretene Thesen wertlos oder unrichtig sind.

“Augenblicklich sehr beschäftigt, sende ich Ihnen eine kleine Ausführung unter Kreuzband, aus welcher Sie sehen, wie wenig ich für mich in Anspruch nehme, und wie sehr ich bemüht bin, den Zusammenhang meiner Gedanken mit älteren aufzuzeigen.

“Einstweilen in ausgezeichneter Hochachtung Ihr ergebenster

“DR. ERNST MACH.”

“WIEN, 17 Juli 1906.”

There is one point in Professor Mach's letter to which I must take exception, and it is the very thing for which he thanks me so

kindly. Professor Mach is under the impression that I reduce the exaggerated praise of Dr. Kleinpeter, and so he expresses his recognition for the damper I put on it, but this is not so. It was not my intention to detract from Professor Mach's fame and greatness, for I believe that I appreciate his worth as much as does Dr. Kleinpeter; and lest others may have read my article in this sense, I will state here publicly that my admiration for Professor Mach can not be less than that of his most ardent disciple and follower. My intention in writing the article on "Professor Mach's Philosophy" was simply to correct a few errors, or what I deemed to be errors, of Dr. Kleinpeter in his statement of Professor Mach's position, as well as my own relation to it. He did not see that in many points I hold exactly or at least approximately the same views, and it is this kinship between us which has so strongly attracted my attention to Professor Mach's writings. That I do not agree in some other points with Professor Mach is true, but even a statement of that difference will not be regarded as an attempt to lower Professor Mach in the opinion of our readers, or minimize his significance in the scientific world. If Dr. Kleinpeter had made this statement in some other publication, I would not have deemed it necessary to make a reply, but having made it in *The Monist*, it was naturally a puzzle to our readers why I allowed it to go unchallenged, and it appeared like an admission. Moreover, a ventilation of the most important philosophical questions and differences with prominent thinkers can only be beneficial, and we have ventured into the discussion because we were confident that Professor Mach would not misconstrue our answer to Kleinpeter, as implying an attack upon himself.

PAUL CARUS.

THREE AND A FRACTION.

Prof. Enno Littmann, of Princeton, New Jersey, who has recently been called to the chair of Coptic and Abyssinian at the University of Strassburg, with reference to an editorial article on "The Number π in Christian Prophecy," in the last *Monist*, informs us that there is at present a belief among the Arabs "that the food a man eats stays with him three days and a third."

"A foreigner who comes as a guest to a table (perhaps even a hostile one)," Professor Littmann continues, "is safe for three days and a third after he has eaten from the bread of that tribe. If I am the guest of an Arab tribe and have eaten their food, then